

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/609,457	57 06/27/2003		Jay Daulton	AB-233U5	6594
23845	7590	01/26/2006		EXAM	INER
ADVANCE	ED BIONI	CS CORPORAT	SAVAGE, JASON L		
25129 RYE	CANYON	ROAD			
VALENCIA, CA 91355				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				.1775	

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
<b></b>	10/609,457	DAULTON, JAY
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jason L. Savage	1775
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the application to become ABANDO	DN. timely filed om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 N	ovember 2005.	
	action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E		
Disposition of Claims		
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1,2,4-8 and 10-13 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1,2,4,6-8,10,12 and 13 is/are rejected 7) ⊠ Claim(s) 5 and 11 is/are objected to.  8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on 04 November 2005 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	are: a) $\square$ accepted or b) $\square$ objection of the drawing (s) be held in abeyance. Station is required if the drawing (s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applic prity documents have been rece nu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ation No ived in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		(770.440)
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summ Paper No(s)/Mai	Date
Notice of Draitsperson's Patent Drawing Review (FTO-940)     Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	#1   Notice of the form	al Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/609,457

**Art Unit: 1775** 

## **Drawings**

The drawings were received on 11-4-05. These drawings are approved.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 4, 6-8, 10 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Byers et al. (US 4,991,582) in view of Schulman et al. (US 6,208,894) and in further view of Whitehurst et al. (US 6,901,296).

Byers teaches a braze assembly comprising a metal member 18 including an exterior flange 64 of the metal member, a braze and a ceramic member 14 including a formed end 26, wherein the formed end of the ceramic member 14 adjoins the inner surface of the exterior flange 64 and is brazed to the metal member with the braze material (Figure 9 and col. 7, ln. 54-68). Byers further teaches the braze is a titanium and nickel alloy (col. 4, ln. 66 – col. 5, ln. 9).

Byers is silent to the ceramic member being substantially close-ended which has a metal end cap which completely closes the ceramic.

Schulman teaches an implantable device (col. 1, ln. 13-21) which comprises a braze assembly including a metal member **264** brazed to a ceramic member **260** (col.

Application/Control Number: 10/609,457

Art Unit: 1775

12, In. 41-67 and Figure 10A). Schulman further teaches that the ceramic member **260** is completely closed by an end cap electrode **112a** (col. 12, In. 41-67 and Figure 10A).

It would have been within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to have recognized that the metal flange containing, self-jigging, connection supporting microstimulator structure of Byers could have been used in a wide variety of known microstimulator devices with a reasonable expectation of success. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to used the brazed assembly structure of Byers as the composite assembly in the microstimulator of Schulman in order to have formed a composite assembly which supports a firm connection between the ceramic and metal members.

However, the prior art of Byers in view of Schulman is silent to the ceramic member being substantially close-ended.

Whitehurst teaches an implantable device comprising a capsule member 152 which is substantially close ended and has an end cap electrode 158 which completely closes the capsule member 152 (figure 3 and col. 8, ln. 58-67). Whitehurst further teaches that the capsule member 152 may be formed from a wide variety of materials including ceramics and that the end cap electrodes 158 are metal (col. 10, ln. 8-18).

It would have been within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art to have used any known end cap and ceramic member structure for the composite device of Byers as modified by Schulman including the end cap structure of Whitehurst with a reasonable expectation of success. Absent a teaching of the criticality or showing of unexpected results from the ceramic member being substantially closed and having the

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 10/609,457

Art Unit: 1775

metal end cap which completely closes the ceramic member, it would not provide a

patentable distinction over the prior art.

Regarding claims 2 and 8, Byers teaches the assembly is suitable for use in

hermetically sealed housing shells for microstimulators (col. 1, In. 7-18).

Regarding claims 4 and 10, Schulman and Whitehurst both teach that the metal

end cap which completely closes the ceramic member is an electrode.

Regarding claims 6-7 and 12-13, Byers teaches the exterior flange 64 forms a

step at the end of the metal member against which the formed end of the ceramic

member may be received (Figure 9). Byers further teaches the surface area between

the members is capable of receiving an adequate amount of braze material to form a

strong braze bond (Figure 9 and col. 7, In. 64-67). Byers also teaches the exterior

flange 64 provides support to the braze assembly. Although Byers does not explicitly

recite the support provided is lateral support, the flange structure of Byers would have

has as much lateral support the assembly claimed by Applicant since Byers teaches the

same structure which is claimed.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5 and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim,

but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of

the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments



Application/Control Number: 10/60 4,457

Art Unit: 1775

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2, 4, 6-8, 10 and 12-13 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason L. Savage whose telephone number is 571-272-1542. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Deborah Jones can be reached on 571-272-1535. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).